2015.10.22 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>   Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Garen:

Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)

Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F totals rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP. The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
> One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total <u>from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels</u>. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)
>
> While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.
>
>
> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>> Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)
>>
>> I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)
>>
>> But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.
>>
>> On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>>> Hi Tara,
>>>
>>> Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.
>>>
>>> But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?
>>>
>>> I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.
>>>
>>> Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.
>>>
>>> Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.
>>>
>>> This way, all concerns are addressed.
>>>
>>> What do you think of this solution?
>>>
>>> G
>>>
>>>
>>> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
> Good Morning Tara,
>
> I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.
>
> I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.
>
> a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.
>
> c) OK
>
> d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.
>
> e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.
>
> Let me know if anything is unclear.
>
> G
>
> On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>> Garen:
>>
>> Here is the revised dbase.
>>
>> - All edits are in RED font.
>>
>> - I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)
>>
>> Complete list of all changes:
>>
>> a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.
>>
>> b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment

(again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) <u>The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review</u>. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

2015.10.22 Venice revised - adjustment calculations moved + publicly owned parcels tab updated + Dennis bldg sf updates.xlsx
258K

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>   Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:00 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)

I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.

Have a good day in the meantime.

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)

Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I

can put it in the B, L, F totals rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP. The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red

(just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>   Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:06 AM
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

LOL. I tore some hair out last night!

Sorry to bog down a perfectly nice Friday. Thanks and talk later :)

On Oct 23, 2015 8:00 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
> Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)
>
> I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.
>
> Have a good day in the meantime.
>
> G
>
> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>> Garen:
>>
>> Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)
>>
>> Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.
>>
>> 1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)
>>
>> 2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2
>>
>> 3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
>> Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350
>>
>> 4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
>> Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,
>>
>> 5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.
>>
>> 6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)
>>
>> 7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format
>>
>> For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F <u>totals</u> rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. <u>This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP</u>. The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
> One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total <u>from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels</u>. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)
>
> While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.
>
>
> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>> Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)
>>
>> I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)
>>
>> But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.
>>
>> On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>>> Hi Tara,
>>>
>>> Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database
1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>   Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 3:20 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

I haven't been able to finish this. I will get it to you on monday, sorry.

Have a good weekend.

G

On Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:06 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

LOL. I tore some hair out last night!

Sorry to bog down a perfectly nice Friday. Thanks and talk later :)

On Oct 23, 2015 8:00 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)

I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.

Have a good day in the meantime.

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)

Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F <u>totals</u> rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. <u>This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP</u>. The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total <u>from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels</u>. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>   Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 3:31 PM
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thanks. I'm going to go ahead and do an alternative version where I move the *0.93 from the Assessment column to the B, L, F Total columns.

Previously I had them in the B, L, F underlying columns (e.g. BRes, BComm.). They are at least much easier to see there when the other columns are hidden.

I have found no other way to generate the Assessment Source table in an accurate way.

Even if you decide you want the dbase rendered differently, I need it done the other way to generate the Assessment Source table for the MDP. Maybe that means two versions of the same document. We can resolve that Monday.

Thanks - have a great weekend.

On Oct 23, 2015 3:20 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
I haven't been able to finish this. I will get it to you on monday, sorry.

Have a good weekend.

G

On Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:06 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

LOL. I tore some hair out last night!

Sorry to bog down a perfectly nice Friday. Thanks and talk later :)

On Oct 23, 2015 8:00 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)

I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.

Have a good day in the meantime.

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)

Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902,

4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F <u>totals</u> rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. <u>This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP.</u> The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total <u>from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels</u>. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Tue, Oct 27, 2015 at 4:09 PM

Garen:

Have you had a chance to review the changes? I've had Ed on standby for a few days, expecting to get him the database and revised MDP. I'd like to be able to update him so he can best manage his workload.

Thanks,
Tara

On Oct 23, 2015 3:31 PM, "Tara Devine" <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

> Thanks. I'm going to go ahead and do an alternative version where I move the *0.93 from the Assessment column to the B, L, F Total columns.
>
> Previously I had them in the B, L, F underlying columns (e.g. BRes, BComm.). They are at least much easier to see there when the other columns are hidden.
>
> I have found no other way to generate the Assessment Source table in an accurate way.
>
> Even if you decide you want the dbase rendered differently, I need it done the other way to generate the Assessment Source table for the MDP. Maybe that means two versions of the same document. We can resolve that Monday.
>
> Thanks - have a great weekend.
>
> On Oct 23, 2015 3:20 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>> I haven't been able to finish this. I will get it to you on monday, sorry.
>>
>> Have a good weekend.
>>
>> G
>>
>> On Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:06 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>>> LOL. I tore some hair out last night!
>>>
>>> Sorry to bog down a perfectly nice Friday. Thanks and talk later :)
>>>
>>> On Oct 23, 2015 8:00 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>>>> Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)
>>>>
>>>> I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.
>>>>
>>>> Have a good day in the meantime.
>>>>
>>>> G
>>>>
>>>> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>>>>> Garen:
>>>>>
>>>>> Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)
>>>>>
>>>>> Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F <u>totals</u> rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. <u>This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP.</u> The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,

Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong

was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) <u>The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review</u>. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

Re: 2015.10.22 Venice database
1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, Oct 27, 2015 at 5:02 PM

Tomorrow morning- I had two other urgencies come up, I'm done with those.

> On Tue, Oct 27, 2015 at 4:09 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>
>> Garen:
>>
>> Have you had a chance to review the changes? I've had Ed on standby for a few days, expecting to get him the database and revised MDP. I'd like to be able to update him so he can best manage his workload.
>>
>> Thanks,
>> Tara
>>
>> On Oct 23, 2015 3:31 PM, "Tara Devine" <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Thanks. I'm going to go ahead and do an alternative version where I move the *0.93 from the Assessment column to the B, L, F Total columns.
>>>
>>> Previously I had them in the B, L, F underlying columns (e.g. BRes, BComm.). They are at least much easier to see there when the other columns are hidden.
>>>
>>> I have found no other way to generate the Assessment Source table in an accurate way.
>>>
>>> Even if you decide you want the dbase rendered differently, I need it done the other way to generate the Assessment Source table for the MDP. Maybe that means two versions of the same document. We can resolve that Monday.
>>>
>>> Thanks - have a great weekend.
>>>
>>> On Oct 23, 2015 3:20 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>>>> I haven't been able to finish this. I will get it to you on monday, sorry.
>>>>
>>>> Have a good weekend.
>>>>
>>>> G
>>>>
>>>> On Fri, Oct 23, 2015 at 8:06 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> LOL. I tore some hair out last night!
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry to bog down a perfectly nice Friday. Thanks and talk later :)
>>>>>
>>>>> On Oct 23, 2015 8:00 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
>>>>>> Geee, I thought today was going to be easy! :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I have some thoughts right now, but let me be more deliberated and get back to you later today, probably in the afternoon.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Have a good day in the meantime.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> G
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Garen:

Attached is the revised database. After I receive your comments on this, I'll re-send you a final (see last situation below that I'd like to address with your blessing.)

Since the version dated October 13th, which you reviewed this morning, the following changes have been made, all per your request except the first.

1) Updated Publicly Owned Parcels table (Tab #2) - reflects comments from other Clerk staff on MDP (request to add columns A, F, G and add subtotals by agency)

2) Changed ownership of APN 4286030903 from State to City in both main Tab #1 and publicly owned Tab #2

3) Moved the calculation of the 7% marketing adjustment from columns AI, AS and AZ to column BI. This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226001902, 4226001903, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914, 4286030903, 4238018900, 4238002900, 4286015900
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 167, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 350

4) Moved the calculation of the "sand" adjustments from column AZ to BC (I cannot do this in Column BI as the adjustment applies only to the LOT and not the total.) These adjustments vary by APN and reflect the % of that parcel that is non-serviced sand (as opposed to the improved portions of the parcel). This occurs for the following APNs: 4226001900, 4226001901, 4226002900, 4286027902, 4286028902, 4286029902, 4288029909, 4288029900, 4288029910, 4288029916, 4288029906, 4288029914,
Under the current sort, those APNs correspond to Rows 2, 3, 6, 181, 200, 203, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,

5) Moved the LAUSD adjustments from columns AI, AS and AZ to AN, AW and BC respectively. This occurs for only one APN: 4238002902, corresponding to Row 227 in the current sort.

6) all of the updates from your 4:30 PM email today re: Dennis corrections (bldg sf checks)

7) removed the red font from last round of edits, hid columns to show the preferred streamlined format

For both #3 and #4, I carefully double-checked to make sure that relocating the reductions did not alter the assessments (Column BI.)

FYI - All of the tables are either static or automated to update from the main tab, except for the 2nd & 4th. 2nd is fully updated. 4th is forthcoming from Ed Henning's data. I did eyeball all of the others to make sure they were updating correctly based on main tab changes.

Lastly, I'd like to discuss a problem I need to resolve that I realized (just now) was caused by having moved the *0.93 out of the bldg, lot and frontage fields and into column BI, per your request. I think I need to move it back, although I can put it in the B, L, F <u>totals</u> rather than the underlying fields that are normally hidden (AI, AS, AZ.)

It makes the table in green (at the bottom of main tab) completely inaccurate. <u>This is problematic, because I need to create and insert this table in my MDP.</u> The bldg, lot and frontage totals are now all off, because they include bldg, lot and/or frontage that's not being assessed (the 7% adjustment.) You'll note a variation between the totals generated in that green chart and the total assessment (the green chart is wrong and it took me awhile this evening to figure out why.) The green chart is used in the MDP, and needs to match: BI466 matched up with H490 before the *0.93 got moved to the assessment total (BI) rather than the underlying bldg sf, lot sf and frontage. The only way I see to do this is to apply the 0.93% to bldg, lot and frontage totals. If you see another way, I'm totally open to it. It's late and I'm tired, so perhaps I'm missing something.

Also, moving the LAUSD adjustment also throws off my check-and-balances subtotals at the bottom (Rows 465-471 - all totals calculated two ways) - there's now a gap equal to the LAUSD adjustments. But I can live with that. That's really just for my use - it helps alert me to any data corruption and can point me to where it is.

Please let me know if you're okay with my moving the *0.93 out of BI and back to the B, L, F totals - unless you have an alternate solution. And please let me know if you have questions or comments. I'm available by phone most of Thursday and Friday.

NOTE: If your concern is that the adjustments be readily visible, I think that moving them to the to the B, L, F totals helps that. Also, please note that the "sand" and marketing adjustments are also shown very clearly on the publicly owned parcels tab #2 (that table will be included in the MDP.)

Thank you for your review!

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total <u>from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels</u>. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number form adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
A&B
On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures

by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that the there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of $ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "BI466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and

frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the $ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for $ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) <u>The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review</u>. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621